UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/354,602	07/16/1999	MICHAEL D. ELLIS	UV-115	5361

7590   03/18/2004

G VICTOR TREYZ
FISH & NEAVE
1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 100201104

EXAMINER
SHANG, ANNAN Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/354,602	ELLIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Annan Q Shang	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 July 1999*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-98* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-98* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) .
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2,5,6,7,8*.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-12, 14-24, 26-30, 32-44, 46-56, 58-62, 64-76, 78-86, 88-93 and 95-98,

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hendricks et al**

(6,515,680) in view of **Thompson et al (5,644,775)**.

As to claim 1, note the **Hendricks et al** reference figures 28g and 29g,

disclose a viewer interface for a television program delivery system and further disclose

a system in which a television program having a plurality of associated tracks having

content is distributed to a plurality of users, and where the content of each track is in a

language and the content of at least two different tracks are in different languages, the

system comprising the following:

the claimed "the interactive program guide..." is met by Interactive Major Menu

Screen (Int-MMenu) of Fig. 29g (col. 43, lines 53-56), note that Int-MMenu is an

interactive television guide (IPG) with date, time, Help feature, GO icons, various tiles

such as HOME ALONE 3 (PG), etc., "various functions" that are implemented on Set

Top Terminal (STT) 220 "interactive television program guide equipment" having a

Display 888 of TV 222 (figs. 13 and col. 33, lines 28-39) col. "user television equipment"

(figs 5a/b, 27a/b/c, col. 19, lines 7-44 and col. 42, line 27-58); where

the Int-MMenu displays program guide display screen text (PG-text) for the

Various Functions in at least one MMenu "program guide" display screen on TV 222;

and a Selector within TV 222 permits selection of different foreign language, for the

same video, by the user and enables the playing of the television program and one or

more of the plurality of associated tracks (col. 10, lines 47-61);

the claimed "means for providing program guide display screen text..." is met by

Generate Text (Gen-Text) 884 of STT 220 (fig. 27c and col. 43, lines 32-44), note that

Gen-Text provides PG-Text in ENGLISH "one or more languages" to the Int-MMenu;

the claimed "means for providing a user with an opportunity to select a

language..." is met by Int-MMenu screen, which provides the user with an opportunity to

select a different foreign languages for the same video (col. 10, lines 47-61); and further

teaches where the STT 220 selects one or more tracks having the content in the

language selected by the user for playing by user TV 222.

Hendricks fails to explicitly teach means for providing PG-Text on TV 222 using

the Int-MMenu in the language selected by the user.

However, note **Thompson et al** reference disclose methods and systems for

translation of on-screen text associated with application programs into languages other

than English (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines 22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of

Hendricks to convert PG-Text in English to other languages to provide PG-Text in other

languages besides English, thereby offering services world wide.

As to claim 2, Hendricks further discloses providing PG-Text in English to an Int-MMenu comprises providing PG-Text in a continuous data stream having PG-Text in English language and selecting different foreign language audio for the same video (col. 10, lines 47-62)

Hendricks fails to explicitly PG-Text in the language selected by the user and PG-Text in a language other than the language selected by the user and filtering the PG-Text in the language other than the language selected by the user out of the continuous data stream.

However, note **Thompson et al** reference disclose methods and systems for translation of on-screen text associated with application programs into languages other than English and further filtering the text in the selected language (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines 22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of Hendricks to convert English PG-Text to the PG-text of the language selected language besides English, by filtering out the PG-text in the selected language, to provide foreign language PG-Text to the user to enable user read from the PG-Text and access information in the selected language accordingly.

As to claims 3 and 4, Hendricks further discloses providing English PG-Text to Int-MMenu in response to a demand generated by Int-MMenu and providing an English PG-Text and playing only the selected different foreign language for the same video (col. 10, lines 47-62, col. 35, lines 19-36 and col. 44, lines 49-57), but fails to explicitly

teach PG-Text in the language selected by the user and PG-Text in a language other than the language selected by the user and filtering the PG-Text in the language other than the language selected by the user, which has been previously discussed in the rejection of claim 2.

As to claims 5-7, Hendricks further indicates an English Language PG-Text by displaying a text in English using the Int-MMenu and playing only the selected different foreign language audio for the same video by the user and where the default language is English (col. 10, lines 47-62, col. 35, lines 19-36 and col. 44, lines 49-57), but fails to display PG-Text in a language besides English, which has been previously discussed with respect to claim 2.

As to claim 8, Hendricks further selected different foreign language audio for the same video by the user and extracting the language out of other foreign language tracks (col. 10, lines 47-62), but fails to explicitly teach extracting PG-Text in the selected language.

However, **Thompson** extracts on-screen text associated with application programs into languages other than English (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines 22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of Hendricks to extract English PG-Text and convert to the PG-text of the selected language, to provide a foreign language PG-Text to the user to enable user read from the PG-Text and access information in the selected language accordingly.

As to claim 9, Hendricks further teaches where the Int-MMenu is programmed with compressed PG-Text in English and decompressing the compressed program PG-Text that is programmed into Int-MMenu (col. 7, lines 10-40, col. 10, lines 47-61, col, 11, lines 43-53 and col. 19, lines 23-42), but fails to explicitly teach displaying PG-Text in a selected language by the user, which is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 2.

As to claims 10-12, Hendricks further teaches providing a user with the opportunity to access PG functions and plurality of associated foreign languages and displaying the English PG-Text using Int-Menu in the selected foreign language by the user and displaying PG-Text "Press GO Here to Return to Menu A" and "Press GO Here to Return to Cable TV" (fig. 29g and col. 43, lines 53-67. col. 40-61 and col. 46, lines 16-42), that is not related to TERMINATOR 4 "television program" in the selected television program and selected foreign language (col. 7, lines 10-40), and displaying PG-Text using Int-MMenu in English language, i.e. Press GO Here to Order" and other various English Text messages relating to TERMINATOR 4.

Hendricks fails to explicitly teach displaying PG-Text in the language selected by the user and PG-Text that is not related to the language selected and also related to the television program.

However, **Thompson** teaches converting on-screen text associated with application programs into languages other than English (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines 22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of Hendricks to extract English PG-Text and convert to the PG-text of the selected language, to provide foreign language PG-Text to the user to enable user read from the PG-Text and furthermore to provide PG-Text or various screen text that is not related or related to the television program to further enable the user to access additional information related to the program, or to enable the user to select other programs from PG-Text not related to the selected language, and furthermore providing the user with additional information to enhance the PG-Text.

As to claims 14 and 15, Hendricks further teaches where each track associated with the television program is an analog audio track carrying audio and the user selects a foreign language using Int-MMenu to select and play different foreign language tracks or audio for the same video (col. 7, lines 10-40), and uses the Int-MMenu to indicate which of analog audio tracks carry analog audio in the language selected by the user.

As to claim 16, Hendricks further discloses where each track associated with the television program is an analog and digital audio track carrying analog and digital audio and where the user cal interact to select one or more foreign language for the same video for playing (col. 10, lines 3-26, lines 47-61 and col. 11, line 54-col. 12, line 32), note further that the subscriber may select desired programming through a menu-driven scheme or directly accessing a specific channel by entering the actual channel number via a remote control device, which meets the claimed limitation "without activity from the interactive television program guide (col. 12, lines 58-66).

As to claim 17, Hendricks further discloses passing a track map and language identifier using Int-MMenu for selecting one or more foreign language track for the same vdieo having the content in the foreign language select by the user without activity from Int-MMenu (col. 10, lines 3-26, lines 47-61 and col. 11, line 54-col. 12, line 32), note that by directly accessing a specific channel a track map and a specific foreign language identifier is passed using the Int-MMenu, which enables the playing of a specific foreign language for the same video.

Claim 18, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 16.

Claim 19, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 16.

Claim 20, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 16.

Claim 21, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 17.

As to claims 22-24, Hendricks further teaches displaying currency in a currency, displaying time and date in format associated with the English PG-Text (figs. 29e, 29g), but fails to explicitly teach displaying PG-Text currency in a currency, displaying time and date in the selected language.

However, **Thompson** extracts on-screen text associated with application programs into languages other than English (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines 22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of Hendricks to extract English PG-Text, including currency, time and date and convert to the PG-text of the selected language, to provide a foreign language PG-Text to the user

to enable user read from the PG-Text and access information, with respect to currency, time and date, in the selected language accordingly.

As to claim 26, Hendricks further teaches displaying a program information for a program with the Int-MMenu on TV 222 when the user highlights a tile "indicates a desire to view information about the program" and inherent displays a foreign language in which the audio for the program is available with the Int-MMenu on TV 222 to enable the user to select a foreign language for the same video (col. 10, lines 47-61, col. 34, line 60-col. 35, line 4, col. 44, lines 49-57 and col. 45, line 61-col. 46, line 7).

As to claim 27 and 28, Hendricks further discloses where the user is provided with an opportunity to select different foreign language using Int-MMenu (col. 10, lines 3-26, lines 47-61), note that since the user has choice of selecting any foreign language for the same video, Hendricks inherently teaches permitting the selection of alternate languages based on the language selected with one or more tracks in the alternative language selected for playing by the TV 222, but fails to explicitly teach displaying PG-Text in the alternate language selected by the user.

However, **Thompson** extracts on-screen text associated with application programs into languages other than English (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines 22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of Hendricks to extract English PG-Text in the alternate language selected by the user and provide a foreign language PG-Text to the user to enable user read from the PG-Text

and access information, with respect to currency, time and date, in the selected

language accordingly.

Claim 29, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 27.

Claim 30, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 27.

As to claim 32, Hendricks further teaches displaying English PG-Text "first

language" on TV 222 and further teaches a various Int-MMenus or English PG-Text that

are different from each other (figs 14-17, 22, 23, 28g and 29g).

Hendricks fails to explicitly teach a second language PG-Text, where the first

portion of English PG-Text is similar to a first portion of the PG-Text in the second

language, where at a least a second portion of the PG-Text in the English PG-Text is

different from a second portion of the PG-Text in the second language and providing the

second language PG-Text portion in a second language.

However, **Thompson** extracts on-screen text associated with application

programs into languages other than English (fig. 3, col. 3, lines 9-22 and col. 4, lines

22-45).

Therefore it would have been clearly obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Thompson into the system of

Hendricks to extract English PG-Text, and convert to the PG-text of a second language,

to provide a foreign language PG-Text to the user converting on to enable user read

from the PG-Text and access information, with respect to currency, time and date, in the

selected language accordingly, note further that at least a first portion of the English

PG-Text will be similar to English PG-Text, since the same text on-screen was changed

to the second language PG-Text, and furthermore at least second portion of the English

PG-Text will be different any specific language PG-Text selected by the user besides

the English PG-Text).

As to claim 33, the claimed method is composed of the same structural elements

that were discussed in the rejections of claim 1.

Claim 34, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 2.

Claims 35 and 36, is met as previously discussed with respect to claims 3 and 4.

Claims 37-39, is met as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-7.

Claim 40, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 8.

Claim 41, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 9.

Claims 42-44, is met as previously discussed with respect to claims 10-12.

Claims 46 and 47, is met as previously discussed with respect to claims 14

and 15.

Claim 48, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 16.

Claim 49, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 17.

Claim 50, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 18.

Claim 51, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 19.

Claim 52, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 20.

Claim 53, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 21.

Claims 54-56, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 22-24.

Claim 58, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 26.

Claim 59-62, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 27-30.

Claim 64, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 32.

As to claim 65, the claimed system is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed in the rejections of claim 1.

Claim 66, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 2.

Claims 67 and 68, are met as previously discussed with respect to claims 3 and 4.

Claims 69-71, are met as previously discussed with respect to claims 5-7.

Claim 72, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 8.

Claim 73, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 9.

Claims 74-76, are met as previously discussed with respect to claims 10-12.

Claims 78 and 79, are met as previously discussed with respect to claims 14 and 15.

Claim 80, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 16.

Claim 81, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 17.

Claim 82, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 18.

Claim 83, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 19.

Claims 84-86, are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 22-24.

Claim 88 and 89, are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 26.

Claim 90-93, are met as previously discussed with respect to claim 27-30.

Claim 95, is met as previously discussed with respect to claim 32.

As to claim 96, the claimed system is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed in the rejections of claim 1.

As to claim 97, the claimed system is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed in the rejections of claim 1.

As to claim 98, the claimed system is composed of the same structural elements that were discussed in the rejections of claim 1.

3.   Claims 13, 45 and 77, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hendricks et al (6,515,680)** in view of **Thompson et al (5,644,775)** as applied to claims 1, 33 and 65 above, and further in view of **Shaffer et al (6,240,170)**.

As to claims 13, 45 and 77, Hendricks as modified by Thompson teach all the claim limitation as previous discussed with respect to claims 1, 33 and 65 respectively, but fails to explicitly teach providing the user with opportunity to confirm the user's selection of a language.

However, note Shaffer et al reference figure 3, disclose method and apparatus for automatic language mode selection that offer the user the opportunity to confirm the language selection (col. 2, lines 50-66 and col. 3, lines 12-23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Shaffer into the system of Hendricks as modified by Thompson to inform the user of his or her selection and confirm the selection, thereby enabling the appropriate selected language.

4.   Claims 25, 57 and 87, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hendricks et al (6,515,680)** in view of **Thompson et al (5,644,775)** as applied to claims 1, 33 and 65 above, and further in view of **Kwoh et al (6,115,057)**.

As to claims 25, 57 and 87, Hendricks as modified by Thompson fail to explicitly teach displaying parental rating in a parental rating format associated with the language selected by the user.

However, note the Kwoh et al reference figures 7-11, disclose displaying parental rating in a parental rating format (col. 7, lines 19-37).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Kwoh into the system of Hendricks as modified by Thompson to provide a parental control display in the selected language and implement parental control text in other languages and provide services to other countries around the world.

5.   Claims 31, 63 and 94 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hendricks et al (6,515,680)** in view of **Thompson et al (5,644,775)** as applied to claims 1, 33 and 65 above, and further in view of **Cookson et al (6,487,365)**.

As to claims 31, 63 and 94, Hendricks as modified by Thompson teach all the claimed limitation as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 33 and 65 respectively, but fails to explicitly teach selecting a subtitle track having subtitles in the language selected by the user for playing by the user television equipment.

However, note **Cookson et al** reference discloses multiple dialog languages that is recorded on separate audio tracks and selecting subtitles of a language for playing.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Cookson into the system of Hendricks as modified by Thompson to provide subtitles for easy selection of languages.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schumacher et al (6,532,442) disclose system for the facilitation of supporting multiple concurrent languages through the use of semantic knowledge representation.

Flores et al (6,370,498) disclose apparatus for multi-lingual user access.

Nakasato (6,182,099) discloses multiple language computer-interface input system.

Kirkland (5,900,908) discloses system and method for providing described television services.

Kanungo et al (5,870,084) disclose system and method for efficiently storing and quickly retrieving glyphs for large character set languages in a set top box.

Freeman et al (5,861,881) disclose interactive computer system for providing an interactive presentation with personalized video, audio and graphics responses for multiple viewers.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Annan Q Shang** whose telephone number is **703-305-2156**. The examiner can normally be reached on **700am-500pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John W Miller** can be reached on **703-305-4795**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the **Electronic**

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Annan Q. Shang.

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER